

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/817,555	04/02/2004	George Alan Vaughan	2001U004.US-CON	4892
7590 03/10/2005		EXAMINER		
Univation Technologies, LLC Suite 1950			RABAGO, ROBERTO	
5555 San Felipe	<b>;</b>		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Houston, TX 7			1713	-
			DATE MAILED: 03/10/2006	<

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

					L0				
		Applic	ation No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Summary		10/817	7,555	VAUGHAN ET AL.					
		Examir	ner	Art Unit					
	·	Roberto	o Rábago	1713					
Period for	The MAILING DATE of this commun Reply	nication appears on	the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence add	lress				
THE M - Extens after S - If the p - If NO p - Failure Any re	RTENED STATUTORY PERIOD F IAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUN ions of time may be available under the provisions IX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this come eriod for reply specified above is less than thirty (3 teriod for reply is specified above, the maximum sit to reply within the set or extended period for reply ply received by the Office later than three months patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	IICATION. s of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no munication. 30) days, a reply within the s statutory period will apply and y will, by statute, cause the	event, however, may a statutory minimum of thi d will expire SIX (6) MO application to become A	reply be timely filed  rty (30) days will be considered timely.  NTHS from the mailing date of this cor  BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status									
1)□ F	Responsive to communication(s) file	ed on							
2a)∐ 1	This action is <b>FINAL</b> .	2b)⊠ This action is	s non-final.						
3)□ \$	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is								
C	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Dispositio	n of Claims								
4) <b>×</b> (	Claim(s) <u>1-15</u> is/are pending in the	application.							
4	a) Of the above claim(s) is/a	are withdrawn from	consideration.						
5) 🗌 (	Claim(s) is/are allowed.								
· <u> </u>	Claim(s) <u>1-15</u> is/are rejected.			•					
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.								
8)∐ (	Claim(s) are subject to restrict	ction and/or election	n requirement.						
Applicatio 	•								
´ <u> </u>	he specification is objected to by th		_						
	he drawing(s) filed on is/are		•	•					
	Applicant may not request that any obje		•	` '					
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including	,	•	• •	· /·				
	he oath or declaration is objected to	o by the Examiner.	note the attache	a Office Action of form PTC	J-152.				
Priority un	ider 35 U.S.C. § 119								
a) 1 2	cknowledgment is made of a claim  All b) Some * c) None of:  Certified copies of the priority  Copies of the certified copies	documents have b	een received. een received in A	Application No	Stago				
	application from the Internation			i received iii tiiis National S	nage				
* Se	e the attached detailed Office action	•	` ''	received.					
Attachment(s	•								
	of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (F	PTO-948)		Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date					
3) 🛭 Informa	ition Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/2/04</u> .			nformal Patent Application (PTO-	152)				

Application/Control Number: 10/817,555 Page 2

Art Unit: 1713

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Information Disclosure Statement

1. No copy of reference AQ has been provided. It would appear that applicants intended to cite WO 03/037938; however, this reference has also not been considered because only the odd pages have been provided, and it has not been cited on form 1449. Applicants are reminded that all papers filed should be printed on only one side of each page.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
  - The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 3. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. A polymer density of 0.20 g/cm³ makes no sense. Review of applicants' cited section of the specification reveals that a value of 0.920 should have been stated in the claim.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Application/Control Number: 10/817,555 Page 3

Art Unit: 1713

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1, 6-9, 11 and 13 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Follestad et al. (WO 00/50466).

The reference discloses ethylene/hexene copolymerization using two metallocene catalysts resulting in a bimodal polymer composition (Examples 1 and 2, Figure 1), further disclosing gas phase methods (pg. 17, lines 1-15) and films (pg. 19, col. 34-37). The reference has not determined the claimed density function relationship, but one of ordinary skill in the art would conclude that the substituted indenyl zirconocene would have substantially smaller copolymerization activity, inclusive the claimed density function and reactivity relationships, in view of steric crowding at the front of the molecule. The burden of proof is shifted to applicants to show that the applied reference examples do not contain the claimed density function and reactivity relationships.

# Double Patenting

6. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA

Art Unit: 1713

1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

- 7. Claims 1-15 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-78 of U.S. Patent No. 6,828,394. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because substantially the same process is being claimed; if the patented claims were prior art, they would serve as a basis for rejection of the instant claims under 35 USC 102. The only difference between the instant claims and those already patented is that while the patented claims require certain metallocene structures, the instant claims require certain polymer properties. However, the instant polymer properties would be obtained merely by use of the patented method, and therefore the instant claims are not separately patentable.
- 8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Roberto Rábago whose telephone number is (571) 272-1109. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday Friday from 8:30 am 4:00 pm.

Art Unit: 1713

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wu can be reached on (571) 272-1114. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Roberto Rábago Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1713

RR March 7, 2005